UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,705	03/09/2004	Scott Meredith	M61.12-0596	2881

27366 7590 09/11/2007

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER	
TAKELE, MESEKER	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/796,705	MEREDITH, SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Meseker Takele	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 06/14/2007.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 16 and 19 are independent claims. In the instant Amendment, claims 1, 9, 12-13 and 15-16 were amended and claim 11 was canceled. This action is made Final.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore (US Pub No: 2002/0078069) in view of Richards et al. (US Patent No.: 5,995,921).

As to claim 1, Moore discloses, a computer-implemented method for creating a task identifier for identifying a file within a system for providing help content to computer operator (example, such as file naming, name of the directory for each class, the string, see paragraph [0034], abstract and Figure 1 (element 216)).

providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a first of a plurality of elements that together form the task identifier (example, History, Math, Science and English, see paragraph [0031])

receiving a selection from the user that is indicative of a word selection from the limited set of word selections (example, user make selection (e.g., "MATH",) see paragraph [0034])

and assigning said word selection to represent the first of the plurality of elements (example, such as "JL" that the created data file is the first in the series created by the document control object, see paragraph [0035] and Figure 4A).

However Moore does not specifically disclose help-related task described in the content of the file.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose help-related task described in the content of the file (example, help files, see Figure 2 (element 228)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's automatic file name generator at the time of the invention was made with help files as presented by Richards.

The motivation to combine to provide an improved help interface capable of receiving user-defined queries in a natural language and selecting the most appropriate answer from a plurality of potential answers through which user can interact with software.

As to claim 2, Moore discloses providing the user with a second limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a second of the plurality of elements (example, such as a list box appears with a list of classes, see paragraph [0029])

receiving a second selection from the user that is indicative of a word selection from the second limited set of word selections; and assigning said word selection from

the second limited set of word selections to represent the second of the plurality of elements (example, student selects date or sequential number, see paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 3, Moore discloses wherein providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a first of a plurality of elements comprises providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent an object element (example, History, Math, Science and English see paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 4, Moore discloses wherein providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a first of a plurality of elements comprises providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent an action element (example "find", see paragraph [0039]).

As to claim 5, Moore discloses further comprising a step of assigning said file to at least one taxonomic category based on the selection received from the user (example, ".backslash.CLASSES" directory, see paragraph [0028]).

As to claim 6, Moore discloses further comprising a step of assigning said file to more than one taxonomic category based on the selection received from the user (example, student create new data, list box appears with list of classes, see paragraph [0029]).

As to claim 7, Moore discloses wherein the pluralities of elements are arranged in accordance with a predetermined structure of organizational elements (predetermined document structure, see paragraph [0021]).

As to claim 8, Moore does not disclose a predetermined order of linguistic structural components.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose a predetermined order of linguistic structural components (example, users natural language, see col., 1 line, 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's automatic file name generator at the time of the invention was made with user's natural language as presented by Richards.

The motivation to combine provide a help interface in which the user may query the help facility using words, phrases and terminology of the user's natural language.

As to claim 9, Moore discloses a task identifier (example, such as file naming, name of the directory for each class, the string, see paragraph [0034], abstract and Figure 1 (element 216)) wherein the task identifier includes an action element selected from a limited set of action choices (example "find", see paragraph [0039]).

However Moore does not specifically disclose help content to a user.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose help content to a user (example, help files, see Figure 2 (element 228).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's automatic file name generator at the time of the invention was made with help files as presented by Richards.

The motivation to combine to provide an improved help interface capable of receiving user-defined queries in a natural language and selecting the most appropriate answer from a plurality of potential answers through which user can interact with software.

As to claim 10, Moore discloses further comprising at least one object element selected from a limited set of object choices (example, user make selection (e.g., "MATH", see paragraph [0034]).

As to claim 12, Moore discloses wherein the action element is delineated as being affiliated with at least one taxonomic category (example, ".backslash.CLASSES" directory, see paragraph [0028]).

As to claim 13, Moore discloses wherein said action element is delineated as being affiliated with more than one taxonomic category (example, a new document control object associate with the template document, see paragraph [0034-0035]).

As to claim 14, Moore discloses wherein the task identifier further comprises a plurality of elements arranged in accordance with a predetermined structure (example, predetermined document structure, see paragraph [0021]).

As to claim 15, Moore does not disclose a plurality of elements arranged in accordance with a predetermined order of linguistic structural components, more specifically in accordance with predetermined order of categories of parts of speech.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose a plurality of elements arranged in accordance with a predetermined order of linguistic structural components, more specifically in accordance with predetermined order of categories of parts of speech (example, users natural language, speech synthesis, see col., 1 line, 65 and col., 15 line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's automatic file name generator at the time of the invention was made with user's natural language as presented by Richards.

The motivation to combine provide a help interface in which the user may query the help facility using words, phrases and terminology of the user's natural language.

As to claim 16, Moore discloses computer-implemented method for at least semi-automatically applying a taxonomic classification to a file to be incorporated into a system for providing help content to a user (example such as automatically naming, automatically entered into the title depending on which class the student selects ".backslash.CLASSES" see paragraph [0024], [0031], [0030] and [0028]), the method comprising:.

assigning a first taxonomic category to a first word selection from a set of word selections (example, ". backslash.CLASSES" directory, see paragraph [0028]);

providing a user with the set of word selections that can be assigned to represent an element of a task identifier (example, ".backslash.CLASSES" directory, see paragraph [0028]). receiving a selection from the user that is indicative of the first word selection from the set of word selections, the first word selection having a meaning that is indicative of the help-related task, (example, such as user makes selection "Math", see paragraph [0034]);

and assigning the first taxonomic category to the file based on the selection received from the user (example, ".backslash.CLASSES" directory, one for each class, see paragraph [0028]).

However Moore does not specifically disclose help-related task described in the content of the file.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose help-related task described in the content of the file (example, help files, see Figure 2 (element 228).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's automatic file name generator at the time of the invention was made with help files as presented by Richards.

The motivation to combine to provide an improved help interface capable of receiving user-defined queries in a natural language and selecting the most appropriate answer from a plurality of potential answers through which user can interact with software.

As to claim 17, Moore discloses assigning a second taxonomic category to a first word selection from a set of word selections (example, such as "JL" that the created data file is the first in the series created by the document control object, see paragraph [0035] and Figure 4A)

and assigning the second taxonomic category to the file based on the selection received from the user (example, student selects date or sequential number, see paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 18, Moore discloses wherein assigning a first taxonomic category to a first word selection from a set of word selections further comprises assigning a first taxonomic category to a first word selection from a limited set of word selections (example, History, Math, Science and English see paragraph [0031]).

As to claim 19, Moore discloses wherein each task identifier includes an element selected from a limited vocabulary (example, such as document control object, name of the directory for each class, the string, see paragraph [0034] and figure 1,element 216).

However Moore does not specifically disclose sorting a plurality of help files within a system for providing help content.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose sorting plurality of help files (example, sorting, help files, see Figure 6E (element 648) and Figure 2 (element 228)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's automatic file name generator at the time of the invention was made with sorting as presented by Richards.

The motivation to combine to provide computing and ranking the cumulative values of the potential answers, to present user with the highest ranking value answer in response to the query.

As to claim 20, Richards discloses comprising sorting the plurality of help files based at least in part on a taxonomic category assigned to said element (example, sorting, help files, see Figure 6E (element 648) and Figure 2 (element 228)).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meseker Takele whose telephone number is (571) 270-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30AM- 5:00PM est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MT

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100